

Dear MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force

I DO NOT support the network of marine protected areas for the North Central Coast Region of the Marine Life Protection Act. I ask you NOT to select Package 4 as your preferred alternative. Package 4 gets the highest marks from scientists, provides the highest level of protection to special places along the coast, and enjoys support from a wide range of interests. HOWEVER IT DOES NOT ENJOY THE SUPPORT OF RECREATIONAL, CHARTER BOAT AND OTHER COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN, NOR THE COMMUNITIES WHICH ARE SUPPORTED BY THESE FISHERMEN AND WHICH HAVE AN INTRICATE FABRIC OF LIVING BY THE SEA AND UTILIZING ITS RESOURCES IN A SUSTAINABLE MANNER.

Marine protected areas, especially fully protected marine reserves, are an investment in the future health of our coastal waters but at the same time they are destroying what is left of our fishing communities and our fishing people, whether commercial sport or recreational. Scientific studies confirm that marine reserves harbor more and bigger fish and support a greater diversity of life than other areas. THIS OF COURSE MAKES ABUNDANT SENSE, SINCE IF YOU UTILIZED NOTHING FROM AN AREA YOU WOULD EXPECT THE FISH TO GROW AND THAT OTHER THINGS WOULD BE PRISTINE AND UNDISTURBED. HOWEVER, OUR FEDERAL FISHERIES POLICIES FOR THE LAST 30 YEARS HAVE BEEN TO AIM FOR THE MAXIMUM SUSTAINABLE YIELD. THIS HAS PUT HEALTHY LOW COST PROTEIN ON FAMILIES TABLES FOR GENERATIONS. AT A TIME WHEN AMERICANS ARE INCREASING THE AMOUNT OF HEALTHY FISH THEY CONSUME IT SEEMS COUNTER-PRODUCTIVE TO FURTHER BURDEN AND DIMINISH AMERICAN FISHERMEN. Healthy oceans support our coastal communities and our economy.

AND THE OCEANS ARE HEALTHY NOW WITH OVER 75% OF OUR FISHERIES EITHER UNDER UTILIZED OR UTILIZED TO THEIR BEST CAPACITY. Please DO NOT give California any more marine protected areas, marine sanctuaries or marine reserves.

Sincerely,
PETER H. FLOURNOY
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

BRTF members,

My name is David Lee and I live in Danville CA. In fact I have spent my whole life fishing, diving and hunting from the Bay Area. I have been following the progress of the MPA proposals that are up for your consideration. As much as I support proposal 2-XA I disapprove of proposals 1-3 and 4. I believe your choice is easy however, because neither proposal meets the requirements of the MPAs as thoroughly as 2-XA. If you choose to advance either of the inadequate proposals you will undermine the legitimacy of the MPA process and lose the support of hundreds of thousands of Californias anglers, divers, conservationists and their supporters. Do the right thing and dismiss these shortsighted proposals from your consideration.

Sincerely,

David Lee
148 Franciscan Dr

Danville CA. 94526

An Open Letter to the Monterey Bay Aquarium

Confused,

As I have been following the MLPA process I sit here wondering why an organization such as the Monterey Bay Aquarium would support proposal 4 when it only affords a "Moderate Level of Protections" for our oceans and why you are not supporting proposal 2-XA that meets 100% of the MLPA guidelines. Proposal 2-XA meets 100% of the habitat protection requirements; in fact it is the ONLY complete proposal according to the Science Advisory Team.

I can't imagine that your organization is so misinformed that they would not support the MLPA proposal that afforded the highest level of protection. Proposal 4 that you seem to support only provides a "Moderate" level while proposal 2-XA provides a "Moderate High" level of protection. Clearly "Moderate High" is better than "Moderate".

Unfortunately we see that the truth is NOT about protecting the environment of the habitat but of "Special Interest Groups" and the typical "Not in MY Back Yard" groups.

Too bad this is truly the one opportunity to provide the protection to the habitat and environment that is sorely needed and organizations such as yours are too involved in special interests and politics and not true conservation.

Doug Wilgis
Supporter of Proposal 2-XA
Bodega Bay, CA

Dear sirs, Just want to let you know that I am opposing proposal #4 for the MLPA. It is to severe and not in the best interest of all parties.

Thank You,
Jim Kehriotis
3230 Montevideo Dr
San Ramon Ca, 94583

Last time I take my family to the Aquarium. Those of us in the know, know the game, and know how you play it.

Thanks for the fair self serving assessment of proposal 4.

Never again.

Mike Marketello

I would like to indicate my opposition to Proposal 4. This proposal would close virtually all recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef, which is the important fishing area north of Point Conception. By

closing the bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef that would put an end to any fishing out of San Francisco Bay. This proposal would create an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo in the Central Coast study area, which is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance with devastating impacts to Pillar Point harbor and users.

Proposal 2-XA does have good solutions at Bodega Bay and Half Moon Bay whereas, Proposal 4 would be devastating for the small boater and actually creates unsafe situations. Proposal 4 places an MPA at Saunders Reef (an area protected by natural winds and typically rough water) resulting in a disproportionate impact to an area that was severely underrepresented on the Regional Stakeholder Group.

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for non-consumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access used by consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point, and when coupled with the private lands to the south becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network. Proposal 4 impacts recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in a massive support from local residents, land owners, fisherman, and conservationists.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sandy Hames

Dear members of the Blue Ribbon Task Force,

I can only imagine how difficult it must be to filter through the individual proposals and all of the related scientific data. Thank you for all of your efforts and I hope that, in the end, the public gets what is best scientifically and economically.

I am writing to express my opposition to Proposal 4. As an active boater and a father, I often take my son out fishing in our small boat from Pillar Point Harbor in Half Moon Bay, San Francisco Bay and occasionally from Bodega Harbor. These trips serve not only to put food on our table, but expose him to so many learning experiences from Mother Nature herself. He has seen whales breaching, has seen the schools of anchovies being "herded" by the whales, numerous different species of porpoises, sea lions, seals and birds. He has even had the opportunity to have had a large salmon taken from him by a sea lion as he reeled it in. He has learned about ecosystems and the delicate balance between the many species in our oceans. These things are far more interesting when learned in a natural environment instead of a classroom.

Proposal 4 is far more restrictive than it needs to be and even puts an SMR between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo which isn't needed to meet the Science Advisory Team goals. The placement of many of their SMR's will make taking my son out in a small boat too risky for a concerned father. The ocean can be a harsh teacher and conditions can change quickly. The distances required if Proposal 4 becomes a reality will eliminate those chances for learning for him, prevent me from helping to feed my family and will adversely affect many other businesses and individuals whose living is affected by access to the sea. Please also consider how Proposal 4 will be enforced. With no fishermen on the water, poachers will have virtually free reign to rape our natural resources. Our Fish and Game wardens are already stretched thin. Their numbers have been reduced and they face increasing challenges with future budget cuts. The true

environmentalists, those that enjoy and spend time in nature's playground, are needed to provide valuable reporting to those that must enforce these new laws.

Please don't let Proposal 4 become a reality for California's coastline, our children and our grandchildren. The little children and the ones yet to be borne are depending upon you to protect their god given right to learn and fish our oceans.

Respectfully yours,

Dave Witte

A California Native, environmentalist and voter

Dear BRTf members,
Mr. Chrisman,

There are various organizations that are misleading the general public with misleading and false information. The Monterey Bay Aquarium and others. These organizations are saying that Proposal 4 provides the best protection. The recent SAT review concludes otherwise. These organizations are asking the public to sign petitions using deceit. The majority of the public are unaware of the MLPA process and the consequences that Proposal 4 will have. It is sad that the issue can be twisted and the people of California mislead.

I'm asking that the BRTF rely on the facts and not just numbers on the petitions and emails in support of proposal 4. Proposal 4 isn't the best proposal based on science and doesn't provide the best level of protection that they are stating.

Choose Proposal 2-XA based on it providing the best Level of Protection MODERATE HIGH and meeting all the size and spacing requirements of the North Central Coast.

Sincerely,
James Volberding

From: GrizzlyElec@cs.com [mailto:GrizzlyElec@cs.com]
Sent: Friday, April 11, 2008 5:47 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Oppose Proposal 4

Proposal 4 makes no sense at all to anyone. This would devastate all fishing in San Francisco and Half Moon Bay area to most fisherman and divers who have spent there lives being conservationist in the ocean.

Barry Temple
Owner Grizzly Electric

Restricting access to the fishing grounds that is accessible to the public is not the answer. There is no need to turn our entire costal area into an aquarium.

Also closing all areas accessible to small boat owners is dangerous; it forces fishermen to go to unsafe distances from shore.

Areas can be closed for some species but closing the whole coastal area to all fishing is unacceptable. Groundfish and round fish are resident fish. Salmon are migratory as with striped bass, albacore, and other species. Why close whole areas to all fishing. This does not make sense. The ocean is a universe upon itself. Do not close the whole universe. This is not natural.

Thom Bennett
Oakland, Ca
